

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/903,504	BOUDIER, PIERRE S.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Enrique L. Santiago	2671

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Enrique L. Santiago. (3) Kendrick P. Patterson.
 (2) Charles Labarre. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 April 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claims 1,23,44,59.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hopcroft US patent no. 6,154,215.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: While discussing the independent Claims the examiner discovered that the current version of the claims located in the electronic file wrapper did not include the amendments that were being argued, the examiner stated that updating the claims to include the argued limitation -a configuration manager accepting user configuration information to said process including the selection of one or more of said at least one atomic optimization- would help distinguish the present application from the prior art..